

### III. REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, and 9-11 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 10 and 11 have been amended herein; and, claims 2 and 8 are cancelled. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Furthermore, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is requested.

Claims 1-5 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wood et al. (US Patent No. 6,609,198), hereinafter "Wood".

Applicants have reviewed the Office Action in its entirety and the cited art (Wood) which is alleged to anticipate the claimed invention and respectfully disagree with the Office. As a general position, Applicants do not find in the Final Office Action any specific and detailed cites and elements therein for being the alleged equivalent limitations in Wood. Instead Applicants find various paragraphs cited from Wood and merely general assertions by the Office mirroring claim language for supporting the various rejections based on Wood. For example, what specific elements in Wood is/are the Office alleging teach a HTTP proxy, a SSO server, the Internet, a user, and the like. Further, the general response offered in the Advisory Action does not further aid in the progress of prosecution.

In any event, with respect to claim 1, Applicants submit that Wood fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention, as is required under 102(e). For example, Wood does not teach, or suggest, *inter alia*, “wherein said SSO server is external to and accessible via the Internet to said HTTP proxy.” (*See*, claims 1 and 7). To the contrary, Wood only discloses various elements (e.g., gatekeeper 110, login 120, authorization 140, authentication 130, etc.) that are part and parcel of a single sign-on security architecture. Col. 5, line 37; Figure 1. That is, there is no teaching of, *inter alia*, the distributed elements as in the claimed invention whatsoever.

In view of the foregoing, Wood does not disclose each and every feature of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection. Applicants further submit that independent claim 7 is allowable for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to independent claim 1.

With respect to dependent claims 3-5 and 9, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on the above arguments, as well as for their own additional features.

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 30, 2007

/Joseph J. Christian/

Joseph J. Christian  
Reg. No.: 51,560

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC  
75 State Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Albany, New York 12207  
(518) 449-0044